

18. Gas Storage Building.

	INITIAL ASSESSMENT FORM							
I. SITE NAME AND LOCAT	NOI							
01 SITE NAME Gas storage building CPP-668.	RESS National Engineering Ltory (INEL)							
03 CITY Scoville		04 STATE 05 ZIP CODE 06 COUNTY Idaho 83403 Butte						
09 COORDINATES: NORTH	EAS	T	07 CC	OUNTY CO	DDE 08 CONG. DIST.			
<u>6 9 5 8 7</u>	5 296	5 1 2 5						
10 DIRECTIONS TO SITE (N. on Lincoln Blvd.)				olic roa	d)			
II. OWNER/OPERATOR								
01 OWNER (If known) Department of Energy	(DOE)	02 STREE 785 I	T ADI					
03 CITY 04 STATE 05 ZIP CODE 06 TELEPHONE NUMBE Idaho Falls Idaho 83402 (208) 526-1122								
07 OPERATOR (If known) Westinghouse Idaho	Nuclear Co.	08 STREE	ET ADI Box 4					
09 CITY Idaho Falls		10 STATI	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
III. CHARACTERIZATION C	OF POTENTIAL	HAZARD	<u> </u>					
01 ON SITE INSPECTION	x YES	NO	DATE	E <u>7 /10</u>	/86_			
02 SITE STATUS (Check of	one)				EARS RECEIVED HAZ WASTE			
A. Active SWMU _2	B. Inactiv	re C.	Unkno	wn Sta	ne / urt Stop Unknown			
04 DESCRIPTION OF SUBST		BLY PRESI	ENT, F	CNOWN, C	OR ALLEGED			
05 DESCRIPTION OF POTEN See Hazardous Condition				NT AND/C	OR POPULATION			
IV. INFORMATION AVAILAB	BLE FROM							
01 CONTACT Clifford Clark	02 OF (Ager DOE-			03	TELEPHONE NUMBER (208) 526-1122			
04 PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSMENT D. Joan Poland	ENCY ICO	06 OF		07 TELEPHONE NUMBER (208) 526-3650				
08 DATE 10 / 7 /86 Mon Day Year	<u> </u>				, J.,			

	WAST	E INFORM	ATION		
I. WASTE	STATES, QUANTITIES, AND	CHARACTE	RISTICS		
A. Solid B. Powder C. Sludge xD. Other 03 WASTE CI	r Fines $\overline{}$ F. Liquid	l that ap	TON CUI NO oply)	BIC YARDS OF DRUMSJK tileL	11
II. WASTE	TYPE				
CATEGORY SLU OLW SOL PSD OCC IOC ACD BAS MES	SUBSTANCE NAME Sludge Oily Waste Solvents Pesticides Other organic chemicals Inorganic chemicals Acids Bases Heavy metals	01 GROSS	S AMOUNT	02 UNIT	COMMENTS
III. HAZARI	OOUS CONSTITUENTS	5 04	STOR/DIS	9 05 CON	C. 06 MEASURE
	NAME NUMBI		METHOD		
Use specifi	ic references, e.g., statetions, personnel intervi	<u>te titles</u> Lews, pro	s, sample ocess reco	analysis ords, labo	reports,etc.)

	HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
I	. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
	A. GROUNDWATER CONT. 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL N/A
	1 _ B. SURFACE WATER CONT. 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL
ő	NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: OZ OBSERVED (Date) FOIENTIAL ALLEGED N/A
0:	C. CONTAMINATION OF AIR 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL POULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED N/A
	D. FIRE/EXPLOSIVE CONDITIONS 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED N/A
	E. DIRECT CONTACT 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL OPERATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION ALLEGED N/A
	L _ F. CONTAMINATION OF SOIL 02 _ OBSERVED (Date) _ POTENTIAL 3 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
0:	G. DRINKING WATER CONTAMINATION 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A

HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
I. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS (Continued)
01 J. DAMAGE TO FLORA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
01 K. DAMAGE TO FAUNA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: (include name(s) of species) ALLEGED N/A
01 _ L. CONTAMINATION OF FOOD CHAIN 02 _ OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
01 M. UNSTABLE CONTAINMENT OF WASTES 02 OBSERVED (Date)POTENTIAL (SPILL RUNOFF, STANDING LIQUIDS/LEAKING DRUMS) 03 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
01 N. DAMAGE TO OFFSITE PROPERTY 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
01 O. CONTAMINATION OF SEWERS,STORM 02 OBSERVED(Date) POTENTIAL DRAINS, WWTPS 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
01 P. ILLEGAL/UNAUTHORIZED DUMPING 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED N/A
05 DESCRIPTION OF ANY OTHER KNOWN, POTENTIAL OR ALLEGED HAZARDS None. Radionuclide contamination only.
III. COMMENTS
IV. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (List specific references, e.g., state titles, sample analysis, reports) Site inspections, personnel interviews, and Installation Assessment Report.

PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM
I. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION
FACILITY NAME: CPP Gro Storage Building LOCATION: NOW /ocation of CPP-668/ POINT OF CONTACT: NAME:
ADDRESS:
REVIEWER: Non Foliand DATE: 10/18/86
II. GENERAL FACILITY DESCRIPTION
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITY: (For example: landfill, surface impoundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of facility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed for rating; agency action, etc.) Evalura used watch mid 1970s to stare radio activaly continued gas cylindres. Conscientions were, released up and shapped off site. Any contamination has been cleaned up. No records. CPP 668 has been built on this pite.
III. SCORES
SM =

GROUND WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET									
RATING FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section				
					3.2				
1.ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS Depth to Aquifer of Concern	0123	2		6					
Net Precipitation Permeability of the Unsaturated Zone	$ \begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{array} $	1		3 3					
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3					
Total Route	Characteristics Score		3	15					
2.CONTAINMENT	1	3	3	3.3					
3.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 3 6 9 12 15 18 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1		18 8	, 3.4				
Total Waste	Characteristics Score		0	26					
4. Multiply lines 1 x	: 2 x 3		0	1170					
5. Divide line 4 by 11	70 and multiply by 100	Sgw= (7						

RATING FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section	
					4.2
1.ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS Facility Slope and	© 1 2 3	1		3	
Intervening Terrain 1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall Distance to Nearest	0 1 2 3 0 1 2 3	1 2		3 6	
Surface Water Physical State	0 📵 2 3	1		3	
Total Route	Characteristics Score		6	15	
2.CONTAINMENT	1 2 3	1	0	3	4.3
3.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence Hazardous Waste Quantity	① 3 6 9 12 15 18 ② 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 1		18	4.4
Total Waste	Characteristics Score		0	26	
4. Multiply lines 1 x	: 2 × 3		0	1170	

AIR ROUTE WORKSHEET									
RATING I	FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE				
1.HISTORIC	RELEASE	1	0	45	5.1				
Date and I	Location:	See attached supplement	pages						
If line 1	is 0, the S	Sa = 0. Enter on line 5							
If line 1	is 45, ther	proceed to line 2.							
2.WASTE CHAP Reactivity Incompati	and	1		3	5.2				
Toxicity Hazardous V Quantity	V aste	0 1 2 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	3 1		9 8				
[7	Total Waste	Characteristics Score			20	÷			
3.TARGETS Population 4-mile Ra	adius	0 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30	1		30	5.3			
Distance to Environme	Sensitive	0 1 2 3	2		6	ĺ			
Land Use		0 1 2 3	1		3				
	Total Targe	t Scores			39				
4. Multipl	ly lines 1 >	: 2 x 3			35100				
5. Divide line 4 by 35100 and multiply by 100 Sa = 0									

	s	2 S
GROUNDWATER ROUTE SCORE (Sgw)	0	0
SURFACE WATER ROUTE SCORE (Ssw)	0	0
AIR ROUTE SCORE (Sa)	0	0
2 2 2 Sgw + Ssw + Sa		0
2 2 2 SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)		0
2 2 2 SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)/1.73 = SM		0

DOCUMENTATION RECORDS FOR HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS: As briefly as possible, summarize the information you used to assign the score for each factor (e.g., "Waste quantity = 4,230 drums plus 800 cubic yards of sludges"). The source of information should be provided for each entry and should be a bibliographic-type reference. Include the location of the document.

FACILITY NAME: CPP Gro Storage Building
LOCATION: Now location of CPP. 668
DATE SCORED: 10/18/86
PERSON SCORING: D. Joan Poland
PRIMARY SOURCE(S) OF INFORMATION: Site inspections, personnel interneurs and process records

COMMENTS OR QUALIFICATIONS:

Radio nuclides only

FACTORS NOT SCORED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION:

GROUNDWATER ROUTE

OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action
 Contaminants detected (3 maximum):

None

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Depth to Aquifer of Concern

Name/description of aquifer(s) of concern:

Snake Rivie Plain Agusfer

Depth(s) from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the saturated zone [water table(s)] of the aquifer of concern:

450

Depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal/ storage:

Net	p	re	¢	ŧ	р	i	ta	ti	on

Mean annual or seasonal precipitation (list months for seasonal):

9.07 inches

Mean annual lake or seasonal evaporation (list months for seasonal):

36 inches

Net precipitation (subtract the above figures):

- 26.93 inches

Permeability of Unsaturated Zone

Soil type in unsaturated zone:

An interbedded sequence of basaltic lava flows and sedimentary deposits.

Permeability associated with soil type:

 10^{-7} to 10^{-3} cm/sec

Physical State

Physical state of substances at time of disposal (or at present time for generated gases):

CONTAINMENT

<u>Containment</u>

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

None

Method of highest score:

4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Toxicity and Persistence

Compound(s) evaluated:

= None

Compound with highest score:

None

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of O (Give a reasonable estimate even if quantity is above maximum):

None

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

Checklist for Groundwater Releases

<u>Ide</u>	ntify	ing R	elease	Yes	<u>No</u>
1.	Pote	ntial	for Groundwater Releases from the Unit		
	0	Unit	type and design		
		**	Does the unit type (e.g., land-based) indicate the potential for release?		
		446	Does the unit have engineered structures (e.g., liners, leachate collection systems, proper construction materials) designed to prevent releases to groundwater?	*******	<u> </u>
	0	Unit	operation		
		-	Does the unit's age (e.g., old unit) or operating status (e.g., inactive, active) indicate the potential for release?	_	<u>/</u> .
		-	Does the unit have poor operating pro- cedures that increase the potential for release?		<u> </u>
		-	Does the unit have compliance problems that indicate the potential for a release to groundwater?	_	<u> </u>
	o	Phys	ical condition 🕴		
		-	Does the unit's physical condition in- dicate the potential for release (e.g., lack of structural integrity, deterior- ating liners, etc.)?		<u>/</u>
	0	Loca	tional characteristics		
		-	Is the unit located on permeable soil so the release could migrate through the unsaturated soil zone?	_	
		-	Is the unit located in an arid area where the soil is less saturated and therefore a release has less potential for downward migration?	$\underline{\checkmark}$	
		•	Does the depth from the unit to the uppermost aquifer indicate the potential for release?	and the same of th	_

Checklist for Groundwater Releases

				162	140
-		•	Does the rate of groundwater flow greatly inhibit the migration of a release from the facility?	<u>√</u>	
		-	Is the facility located in an area that recharges surface water?		<u> </u>
	٥	Wast	e characteristics		
		-	Does the waste in the unit exhibit high or moderate characteristics of mobility (e.g., tendency not to sorb soil particles or organic matter in the unsaturated zone)?		_
		•	Does the waste exhibit high or moderate levels of toxicity?	www.marane	_
2.	Evid	ence (of Groundwater Releases		
	o	Exist	ting groundwater monitoring systems		/ :
		-	Is there an existing system?		_ ,
		-	Is the system adequate?	_	
		-	Are there recent analytical data that indicate a release?		<u> </u>
	o	Other	r evidence of groundwater releases		
		-	Is there evidence of contamination around the unit (e.g., discolored soils, lack of or stressed vegetation) that indicates the potential for a release to groundwater?	_	<u>/</u>
		-	Does local well water or spring water sampling data indicate a release from the unit?		<u>/</u>
			he Relative Effect of the Release on Human e Environment		
1.	Ехро	sure	Potential		
	0	Cond	itions that indicate potential exposure		
		-	Are there drinking water well(s) located near the unit?		<u>/</u>
			Does the direction of groundwater flow in- dicate the potential for hazardous constitu-		

SURFACE WATER ROUTE

1. OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action

Contaminants detected in surface water at the facility or downhill from it (3 maximum):

. None

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

Average slope of facility in percent:

0.04%

Name/description of nearest downslope surface water:

Big Lost River

Average slope of terrain between facility and above cited surface water body in percent: $O. O \neq //$

Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?

.100

Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of high elevation?

No

1-year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches

less than 2 inches

Distance to Nearest Downslope Surface Water

1,400 ft.

Physical State of Waste

Solid

3. CONTAINMENT

Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

None

Method with highest score:

Checklist for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases

				<u>Yes</u>	No
<u>Ide</u>	ntifyi	ing Re	eleases		
1.			for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Release acility		
	o		mity to Surface Water and/or to Off-site		
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach the nearest downgradient surface water body?		<u>/</u>
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach off-site receptors (e.g., if facility is located adjacent to populated areas and no barrier exists to prevent overland surface run-off migration)?		<u>/</u>
	0	Relea	ase Migration Potential		
		-	Does the slope of the facility and intervening terrain indicate potential for release?		<u>/</u>
		-	Is the intervening terrain characterized by soils and vegetation that allow overland migration (e.g., clayey soils, and sparse vegetation)?		
		-	Does data on one-year 24-hour rainfall indicate the potential for area storms to cause surface water or surface drainage contamination as a result of run-off?	_	<u>/</u>
	c	Unit	Design and Physical Condition		
		-	Are engineered features (e.g., run-off control systems) designed to prevent release from the unit?		_
		-	Does the operational history of the unit indicate that a release has taken place (e.g., old, closed or inactive unit, not inspected regularly, improperly maintained)?	_	<u>√</u>
		-	Does the physical condition of the unit indicate that releases may have occurred (e.g., cracks or stress factures in tanks or erosion of earthen dikes of surface impoundments)?		<u>/</u>

Checklist for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases

			Yes	<u>No</u>
	0	Waste Characteristics		
		Is the volume of discharge high relative to the size and flow rate of the surface water body?		<u> </u>
		Do constituents in the discharge tend to sorb to sediments (e.g., metals)?		
		Do constituents in the discharge tend to be transported downstream?		<u>/</u>
		 Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of persistence (e.g., PCBs, dioxins, etc.)? 		<u>/</u>
		 Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of toxicity (e.g., metals, chlorinated pesticides, etc.)? 		1
2.	Evid	ence of Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases		
	o	Are there unpermitted discharges from the facility to surface water that require an NPDES or a Section 404 permit?		
	0	Is there visible evidence of uncontrolled run-off from units at the facility?		
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human nd the Environment		/
1.	0	Are there drinking water intakes nearby?		
	o	Could human and/or environmental receptors come into contact with surface drainage from the facility?		
	0	Are there irrigation water intakes nearby?	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	_
	a	Could a sensitive environment (e.g., critical habitat, wetlands) be affected by the discharge (if it is nearby)?		

AIR ROUTE

1.	OBSERVED RELEASE
	Contaminants detected:
	None
	Date and Location of detection of contaminants:
	Methods used to detect the contaminants:
	Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the site:
2.	WASTE CHARACTERISTICS
۷.	
	Reactivity and Incompatibility
	Most reactive compound:
	1/me

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

<u>Toxicity</u>

Most toxic compound:

Vare

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous waste:

Nane

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

Checklist for Air Releases

				<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Ide	ntify	ing Re	eleases_		
1.	Pote	ntial	for Air Releases from the Facility		
	o	Unit	Characteristics		
		-	Is the unit operating and does is expose waste to the atmosphere?	-	1
		-	Does the size of the unit (e.g., depth and surface area) create a potential for air release?	_	<u> </u>
	٥		the unit contain waste that exhibits a rate or high potential for vapor phase ase?		
	٠	-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as vapor releases?	_	<u>/</u> .
		-	Do waste constituents have a high potential for volatilization (e.g., physical form, concentrations, and constituent-specific physical and chemical parameters that contribute to volatilization)?		<u> </u>
	o	cond'	the unit contain waste and exhibit site itions that suggest a moderate or high ntial for particulate release?		
		-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as particulate releases?		<u>/</u>
		-	Do constituents of concern as particulate releases (e.g., smaller, inhalable particulates) have potential for release via wind erosion, reentrainment by moving vehicles, or operational activities?		<u>/</u>
		-	Are particulate releases comprised of small particles that tend to travel off-site?		<u> </u>
	a	Do co affe	ertain environmental and geographic factors ct the concentrations of airborne contaminant	s?	
		-	Do atmospheric/geographic conditions limit constituent dispersion (e.g., areas with atmospheric conditions that result in inversions)?	—/	<u> </u>
			Is the facility located in a hot, dry area?		**************************************

Checklist for Air Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	No
2.	Evide	ence of Air Releases		
	0	Does on-site monitoring data show that releases have occurred or are occurring (e.g., OSHA data)?	_	<u>√</u>
	o	Have particulate emissions been observed at the site?		<u> </u>
	0	Have there been citizen complaints concerning odors or observed particulate emissions from the site?		<u>/</u>
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human and the Environment		
1.	Expos	sure Potential		
	•	Is a populated area located near the site?		

Checklist for Subsurface Gas Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Ide</u>	ntify	ing a Release		
1.	Pote	ntial for Subsurface Gas Releases		
	o	Does the unit contain waste that generates methane or generates volatile constituents that may be carried by methane (e.g., decomposable refuse/volatile organic wastes)?	_	<u>√</u>
	0	Is the unit an active or closed landfill or a unit closed as a landfill (e.g., surface impoundments and waste piles)?	e	<u>/</u>
2.		ation of Subsurface Gas to On-site or Off-site		
	0	Are on-site or off-site buildings close to the unit?	<u>/</u>	
	o	Do natural or engineered barriers prevent gas migration from the unit to on-site or off-site buildings (e.g., low soil permeability and porosity hydrogeologic barriers/liners, slurry walls, gas control systems)?		<u> </u>
	O	Do natural site characteristics or man-made structures (e.g., underground power trans-mission lines, sewer pipes/sand and gravel lenses) facilitate gas migration from the unit to buildings?		<u> </u>
<u>Det</u> Hea	ermin 1th a	ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human nd the Environment		
1.	Ехро	sure Potential		
	o	Does building usage (e.g., residential, commercial) exhibit high potential for exposure?		1

•	^	n	N	T	٨	Ŧ	M	м	Εl	NI	T
1	١.	U	N	11	м	L	W	I۲I	⊏.	N	

Hazardous substances present:

None

Type of containment, if applicable:

2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Direct Evidence

Type of instrument and measurements:

Nane

<u>Ignitability</u>

Compound used:

None

Reactivity

Most reactive compound:

None

Incompatibility

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

Nove

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility:

None

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

TARGETS

Distance to Nearest Population

oft.

Distance to Nearest Building

oft.

Distance to Sensitive Environment

Distance to wetlands:

Greater than 100 feet

Distance to critical habitat:

Greater than 1/2 mile

Land Use

Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:

The INEL is a research facility. There are no commercial/industrial facilities within 1 mile.

Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 1 mile or less:

Greater than 1 mile

Distance to prima agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

If a historic or landmark site (National Register or Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site?

Big Southern Butte

Population Within 2-Mile Radius

1828

Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius

189

DIRECT CONTACT

1.	OBSERVED INCIDENT
	Date, location, and pertinent details of incident:
	None
2.	ACCESSIBILITY
	Describe type of barrier(s):
	Buried.
3.	CONTAINMENT
	Type of containment, if applicable:
	None
4.	WASTE CHARACTERISTICS
	Toxicity
	Compounds evaluated:
	1)-1-

Compound with highest score:

5. TARGETS

Population within one-mile radius

1367

Distance to critical habitat (of endangered species)

Greater than 1 mile